**INT6137 Final project (50%) marking scheme**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Detailed Description** | **A Range (Excellent)** | **B Range (Good)** | **C Range (Satisfactory)** | **D or Below (Poor)** |
| **Chatbot Functionality and Design (UI)** | Evaluates UI's intuitive design, responsiveness, and seamless interaction for organization-specific inquiries, emphasizing Scrum/Agile principles like iterative development, adaptive planning, user feedback, and sprint refinement | Demonstrates strong integration with iterative sprint enhancements and user stories guiding design. Exceptional responsiveness with reasoned choice of frontend frameworks in great details. | Shows effective integration with some iterative enhancements and user stories influencing design. Good responsiveness with basic reasoning on frontend frameworks | Includes basic integration with limited iterative elements and user stories. Adequate responsiveness with minimal reasoning on frameworks. | Lacks integration, with no iterative enhancements or user story guidance. Poor responsiveness without reasoned framework choices. |
| **Chatbot Functionality and Design (Agent design)** | The core logic demonstrates thorough data preparation, integration of advanced features that align with the project need. | Exceptional alignment to problem and project needs, with thorough data preparation and design perfectly fitting the use case, supported by evidence or test results. | Good alignment to problem and project needs, with solid data preparation and design mostly fitting the use case, with basic evidence support. | Adequate alignment to problem and project needs, with basic data preparation and design partially fitting the use case, minimal evidence. | Poor alignment to problem and project needs, inadequate data preparation and design not fitting the use case, lacking evidence. |
| **Performance Evaluation and Monitoring** | The project includes metrics, monitoring tools, and evidence of feedback gathered from end users. | Comprehensive user feedback collection with tailored custom metrics deeply analyzed and iterated upon, supported by evidence showing alignment to user needs. | Solid user feedback and some custom metrics with basic analysis and monitoring, demonstrating good alignment to user needs. | Basic user feedback and minimal custom metrics with superficial evaluation, partial alignment to needs and little evidence of integration. | Lacking user feedback or custom metrics, poor alignment to user needs, no effective monitoring or evidence. |
| **Agile/Scrum Application and Planning (Individual mark)** | Overall use of Agile methodologies like Scrum sprints and planning artifacts (e.g., backlogs), demonstrated in project and presentation. | Exceptional overall application with seamless integration of sprints/artifacts, high team participation evidenced by artifacts, driving project success. | Solid application with clear sprints/artifacts, good participation supporting efforts, some evidence but minor inconsistencies. | Basic application with adequate sprints/artifacts, satisfactory participation meeting minimums, limited impact/evidence. | Poor application, unclear sprints/artifacts, minimal participation lacking contributions, hindering progress. |
| **Legal and Ethical Considerations** | The project design and presentation discussion addressed important aspects including liabilities, privacy, biases, and regulatory compliance. | Comprehensive integration with proactive measures, insightful discussion supported by evidence like audits or frameworks, ensuring high levels of safety and equity. | Good integration with basic measures, clear discussion with limited evidence, meeting standards for safety and equity. | Basic coverage with superficial discussion and minimal measures, fulfilling minimums for safety and equity. | Inadequate integration, no meaningful measures or discussion, low for safety and equity. |
| **Presentation Content and Delivery** | The presentation effectively covered the chatbot’s features, development process, evaluation methods, and its alignment with organizational needs. It was delivered with clarity and confidence, demonstrated strong audience engagement, and reflected balanced participation across the group. | Comprehensive, logically structured content with engaging demos and insightful analysis; delivered confidently with clear communication, strong engagement, balanced participation, and seamless Q&A. | Effective coverage of key elements with good structure and demos; clear delivery with confidence, fair engagement and participation, minor pacing issues. | Basic coverage of essentials, adequate demos; satisfactory delivery with some clarity, limited engagement or balance. | Incomplete or disorganized content, weak demos; lacks clarity/confidence, poor engagement/balance. |
| **Documentation** | The team provided Scrum artifacts (screen captures) and presentation materials, such as slides, to support their project. | Comprehensive documentation with user/customer feedback logs, iteration histories, and well-annotated code; organized, complete, and fully supportive of project understanding | Solid documentation covering key aspects like code/project structures, feedback, iterations/improvements, and code; well-organized with some evidence, but minor gaps in detail or completeness. | Basic documentation addressing essentials (e.g., simple structures, some feedback/iterations, basic code notes); meets minimums but superficial or incomplete in coverage. | Inadequate documentation lacking detail on structures, feedback, iterations, or code; poorly organized or missing elements, failing to support the project effectively. |

* *Bonus points are awarded to individuals*
* *If you score 89% (denoted as a) and earn a 10% bonus (denoted as b), the initial total would be a + b = 89 + 10 = 99%.*
* *If you score 91% (denoted as a) and earn a 10% bonus (denoted as b), the initial total would be a + b = 91 + 10 = 101% . The final mark is determined by taking the minimum of this total and 100%, so min(a + b, 100) = min(101, 100) = 100%*

**Feedback form template**

* Your Name:
* Reviewed Group Name:
* Date of Feedback:
* Phase (Beginning or After First MVP):

**(5% Bonus Eligibility) (Submit on Moodle after Midterm presentation)**

1. Customer Requests for Features
   * List 2-3 specific feature requests based on the topic. Explain the value (e.g., "This would improve user satisfaction because …").
2. Fill in Survey (If provided)
   * If the group provides an initial survey, complete it here or attach responses. Rate overall initial concept (1-5):
   * Comments: Strengths/weaknesses in early planning (e.g., backlog alignment via user stories)?

**After the First MVP (5% Bonus Eligibility)**

1. Performs A/B Testing for Other Groups (If provided)
   * If A/B variants are available, test and compare (e.g., "Version A (text-only) vs. Version B (with images): B had faster response times but lower accuracy on complex queries"). Rate effectiveness (1-5):
   * Comments: Which variant better meets user needs? Suggestions for refinement.
2. Report Bugs (If provided)
   * List any bugs encountered (e.g., "Chatbot crashes on invalid input; error message: 'Undefined variable'"). Include steps to reproduce and screenshots if possible. Rate bug severity (1-5):
   * Comments: Impact on user experience? Recommendations for fixes.
3. Filling in Survey (If provided)
   * If a post-MVP survey is provided, complete it here or attach. Rate MVP performance (1-5):
   * Comments: How well does it align with initial features/problems? Custom metrics (e.g., task completion rate from your tests).
4. Raising Legal Considerations (If provided)
   * Highlight any legal/ethical issues (e.g., "Privacy concern: Chatbot stores user data without consent prompt—suggest GDPR-compliant opt-in"). Rate handling (1-5):
   * Comments: Risks (e.g., biases in responses) and suggestions (e.g., add disclaimers or audits).

**Overall Satisfaction**

* Rating (1-5): As a customer, how satisfied are you with the chatbot overall?
* Comments: Does it deliver value in the organizational context? Would you recommend it? Why/why not? (Reference tests or demos.)

**Comment on User Interface (UI) and Experience**

* Rating (1-5): How intuitive and seamless is the UI/experience?
* Comments: Strengths (e.g., responsive design, visual flows)? Weaknesses (e.g., navigation issues)? Suggestions (e.g., "Add multilingual support for broader accessibility").